

Meeting Notes  
Yurok Environmental Monitoring Workgroup  
Tribal Office, Weitchpec  
Wednesday, August 21, 2002

Participants: Kevin McKernan, Environmental Program Director, Yurok Tribe  
Lori McKinnon, Yurok Tribe Environmental Program  
Jennifer Kalt, California Indian Basketweavers Assoc.  
Ron Johnson, California State University Humboldt  
Ken Fetcho, Yurok Tribe Environmental Program  
Eric Brunton, Yurok Tribe Environmental Program  
Holly Hensher, Karuk Tribe

Ex officio: Kean Goh, Department of Pesticide Regulation  
Pam Wofford, Department of Pesticide Regulation  
Dave Cavyell, Del Norte County Agricultural Commissioner's Office  
Jeff Dolf, Humboldt County Agricultural Commissioner's Office  
John Pricer, Simpson Timber Company  
Rose Patenaude, Northcoast Regional Water Quality Control Board

The meeting notes from March 21, 2002 were reviewed and approved. **Lori** presented the Yurok Tribe Environmental Program (YTEP) spray activities report on the spring 2002 monitoring. The Workgroup had set monitoring priorities for the Johnson Creek and Mettah Creek application areas. Herbicide application at Johnson Creek area, which the YTEP had selected to monitor, was postponed until fall. Two grab samples were collected from Mettah Creek following a small rain event and sent to DPR for analysis. Lack of rainfall prevented additional samples being collected. **Pam** informed the group that the samples did not contain any detectable amount of atrazine or three of its breakdown products, DEA, ACET, or DACT.

**Rose** indicated that the RWQCB has not done any monitoring this year. They are setting up a monitoring plan with Trinity County's Environmental Planning Department for monitoring Forestry herbicide applications. According to **Rose**, Trinity County has a zero tolerance standard, which means that any detection of any chemical would be considered a violation. The monies for the monitoring are from the settlement of a suit with a timber company.

**Ken** discussed the notification of residents about applications in their residential areas. Some residents were concerned about applications along Johnson Creek Road. **John** indicated that it was not required to post notices on the road. **Ken** also asked if Simpson does any quality control checks on the applicators themselves. **John** said that the visual inspection of a treated area is enough to see if the application was done correctly. **Jennifer** asked about how Simpson deals with the occurrence of endangered plants in treated areas. **John** said that he is given maps of noted plants and the area is flagged for protection from logging and herbicide applications.

**Rose** asked about the no-spray zones (buffer areas) that Simpson used around waterways and swales above waterways. **John** indicated that Simpson observes a 25 foot buffer area on class 3 waterways and has a 50-foot buffer up from the top end of the waterway.

**Ken** pointed out residents concern over drinking water sources. **Lori** explained that the Tribe

has mapped out domestic water users, but pointed out that the maps are of the household locations not the intake source of water. **John** said he has requested the map from **Troy Fletcher** and Lori will look into getting one to the County Agricultural Commissioner's Office. **Lori** asked about getting information from the Ag Comm prior to the applications. **Jeff** noted that unless the herbicide used is "restricted" the Ag Comm does not get prior information. A "restricted" chemical requires the applicator to give the Ag Comm 24-hour notice prior to application. The only restricted herbicide that Simpson uses is 2,4-D. **Lori** mentioned that they have gotten information on restricted herbicide applications, but would like prior information on the use of non-restricted pesticides. The question about atrazine and ground water contamination was raised and **John** noted that the problems with ground water have been seen in the valley areas of California where atrazine is applied multiple times on the same land. **Rose** inquired about the multiple applications of forestry herbicides and what the probability was of multiple applications on the same area of forest. **John** responded that an area usually receives an application of pre-emergent herbicide and a later application for conifer release. Additional applications are rarely required.

**Pam** promised a first draft of the final monitoring report to the workgroup at the end of October.

**John** explained that the fall herbicide spray plan would finish up the applications that were noted in the spring spray plan. There will be no aerial applications this fall. Atrazine, Garlon 4 and 2,4-D and will be applied in the Klamath River watershed by backpack sprayers. The target date for start of application has not been determined, but will probably be in mid-September.

**Pam** noted that there is about \$3,000 - \$3,500 dollars left for sample analysis in the contract. The money will allow for approximately 20 samples. The YEMWG determined that the samples will include rain runoff samples from a fall application and some acorn samples from the Johnson Creek area which received an atrazine application in spring. **Lori** noted that they will use ELISA method for analyzing the water samples a with some conventional method for quality control check.

**Lori** described her workplan for a future EPA grant, which will look at alternatives to herbicides for plant control. The YEMWG will be involved with the workplan implementation.

The next meeting will be set for sometime in October for discussion on the herbicide alternatives workplan. DPR personnel will probably not attend. The final meeting with DPR involvement will be in December to present the final report.